

REMARKS

Claim Amendments:

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-14 are amended in the current Response. Claims 5, 12, and 15-28 are canceled. Claims 29-44 are new. Applicant respectfully submits that all claim amendments and all new claims are supported by the application as filed.

Response to Office Action:

In the Office Action mailed from the United States Patent and Trademark Office on June 19, 2006, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and all that depend therefrom under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite and incomplete. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14 and 22-28, as best interpreted by the Examiner, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Angelfire. The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Angelfire in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,282 to Sutcliffe et al. (hereinafter "Sutcliffe") in further view of "InsideBoxing," and over Angelfire in view of Sutcliffe. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 15, 17-22, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutcliffe in view of Angelfire. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully provides the following.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph:

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner found the terms “information” and “location” as used were indefinite, along with other problems.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful consideration of the claims and Applicant has provided extensive and careful amendments to the claims to clarify the claims in these regards.

Applicant believes that the claims as amended correct all issues of indefiniteness, and respectfully requests removal of the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being complete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. Specifically, the Examiner found that no coordination of an event was contained in the claims but was claimed in the preamble. Applicant has amended the claims and believes that the claims as amended clearly provide for the coordination of an event. For example, claim 1 requires providing a made competition, receiving proposals for promoting and hosting the made competition, and receiving acceptances of the proposals by the competitors. Independent claim 8 includes similar limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed steps now include the coordination of an event, and therefore respectfully requests removal of the rejections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

In the Office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-11, 13, 14 and 22-28, as best interpreted by the Examiner, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Angelfire. In

response, Applicant provides the following remarks. The standard for a Section 102 rejection is set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02, which provides:

[F]or anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference does not teach every aspect of the claimed invention.

Claim 1, as amended, contains new limitations to: “providing a made competition between said competitor and at least one of said additional competitors; providing information about said made competition in an electronically searchable format to said competitor, to said at least one of said additional competitors, to at least one of said promoters, and to at least one of said venues; receiving a proposal for promoting said made competition from said at least one of said promoters; receiving a proposal for hosting said made competition from said at least one of said venues; and receiving acceptances of said proposal for promoting and said proposal for hosting from said competitor and said at least one of said additional competitors.” These limitations are not found in Angelfire. Angelfire shows mere solicitation of fighters for certain matches on certain dates in certain locations. It does not disclose any made competitions, providing electronically-searchable information about said made competition to competitors, promoters, and venues, or any proposals for promoting or hosting, or any acceptances of those proposals. For at least these reasons, Angelfire does not anticipate independent claim 1.

Claim 8 contains similar limitations to claim 1 and is at least allowable for the same reasons. Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-11, and 13-14 depend from either claim 1 or claim 8, adding

additional limitations to otherwise-allowable material, and are therefore at least allowable for the same reasons. New claims 29 and 38 contain similar but narrower limitations, and are therefore allowable along with claims 30-37 and 39-44 which depend therefrom. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the removal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Additionally, Applicant notes that the current application claims the benefit of Applicant's co-pending provisional application, Serial Number 60/195,025, filed April 6, 2000, which has an essentially-identical specification to the current application and therefore supports the claims as currently amended. Because Angelfire is dated March 4, 2000, which is less than one year before Applicant's priority date, Applicant respectfully submits that Angelfire is not available as a reference against the current application under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Angelfire in view of Sutcliffe in further view of "InsideBoxing," and over Angelfire in view of Sutcliffe. The Examiner also rejected claims 15, 16, 19, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutcliffe in view of Angelfire. In response, Applicant provides the following:

The standard for a Section 103 rejection is set forth in M.P.E.P 706.02(j), which provides:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, **the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.** The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

(Emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest all the limitations claimed in the claim set provided herein.

As discussed above, Angelfire fails to teach a large number of limitations contained in claim 1. As neither Sutcliffe nor InsideBoxing teach these limitations, Applicant respectfully submits that neither the references individually nor the references in combination teach all of the limitations, as is required to maintain a rejection under Section 103.

Specifically, in the Office Action, the Examiner relied on InsideBoxing as teaching retrieving prior fight information in order to further facilitate coordination of a boxing match over the Internet. As this feature is no longer claimed by Applicant, InsideBoxing is inapposite. The very limited disclosure of InsideBoxing fails to disclose the specific new limitations of Applicant discussed above in relation to Angelfire. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that InsideBoxing also fails to teach the limitations not taught by Angelfire.

Applicant further submits that Sutcliffe also fails to teach these limitations, and that therefore none of the cited references teach the required limitations of claim 1. Sutcliffe teaches a method of matching one user with another (e.g. online dating match services). (Abstract) Even if Sutcliffe is regarded as being applicable to coordinating competitive sporting matches,

Sutcliffe does not disclose the specific limitations of claim 1 regarding the complex interactions between competitors, promoters, and venues once a match (competition) is made. Sutcliffe is simply not directed at these stages of the method which take place after the competition is “made.” In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Sutcliffe as teaching the collection of data and using the collected data for the purposes of proposing matches or allowing one user to locate another. Applicant respectfully submits that such matching simply does not disclose the post-matching steps of “providing a made competition between said competitor and at least one of said additional competitors; providing information about said made competition in an electronically searchable format to said competitor, to said at least one of said additional competitors, to at least one of said promoters, and to at least one of said venues; receiving a proposal for promoting said made competition from said at least one of said promoters; receiving a proposal for hosting said made competition from said at least one of said venues; and receiving acceptances of said proposal for promoting and said proposal for hosting from said competitor and said at least one of said additional competitors.”


For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and all of the claim limitations of claim 1 as is required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Because all other claims are dependent on claim 1 or contain similar and/or narrower limitations directed at the same subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as claimed is not made obvious by the cited combinations of references. For at least these reasons, Applicant therefore respectfully requests removal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

If any impediments to the allowance of this application for patent remain after the above amendments and remarks are entered, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned attorney of record.

DATED this 18 day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael F. Krieger
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 35,232

KIRTON & McCONKIE
1800 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 328-3600